

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/052,445	10/052,445 01/23/2002		Yutaka Sakakibara	111752	1955	
25944	7590	07/02/2003				
OLIFF & F		E, PLC	EXAMINER			
P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320				PHASGE, ARUN S		
				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				1753		
				DATE MAILED: 07/02/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			0
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Anti-on Comment	10/052,445	SAKAKIBARA, Y	UTAKA
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Arun S. Phasge	1753	
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence a	ddress
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RETHE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, and If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by such a nature of the proceived by the Office later than three months after the mean earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may and a reply within the statutory minimum of the riod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO tatute, cause the application to become	a reply be timely filed nirty (30) days will be considered time DNTHS from the mailing date of this ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	·		
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑	This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for al closed in accordance with the practice un			he merits is
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the applicat			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with	drawn from consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		•	
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction ar	nd/or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Exan			
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ a			
Applicant may not request that any objection f	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on		disapproved by the Exami	ner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required i	• •		
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	E Examiner.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120			
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for	eign priority under 35 U.S.C	. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:	·		
1. Certified copies of the priority docum			
2. Certified copies of the priority docum	nents have been received in	Application No	
3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the application from the Internationa * See the attached detailed Office action for a	l Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))		l Stage
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dom	nestic priority under 35 U.S.C	C. § 119(e) (to a provisiona	al application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language 15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dom			
Attachment(s)	-	•	
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No.) 5) 🔲 Notice o	w Summary (PTO-413) Paper No of Informal Patent Application (P	
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-326 (Rev. 04-01) Offic	e Action Summary	Part of Paper No. 4	

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Greenberg et al. (Greenberg), U.S. Patent 6,471,873 B1.

Greenberg discloses the claimed method of removing phosphorous from water comprises immersing electrodes into a tank filled with water, applying a DC voltage between the electrodes to generate hydroxide ions through a cation migration in the water and/or an electrolysis and precipitating phosphate ions in the water (see col. 17, lines 30-60). The reference further discloses the claimed shapes of the electrodes and the flow through cell (see figures 1-9 and claims 1-

Art Unit: 1753

89). The cell would include some granular solids, such as claimed since it is for the treatment of groundwater (see Abstract).

Therefore, since the Greenberg patent discloses each and every limitation, the claims are anticipated.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greenberg applied as above.

Greenberg, while disclosing the use of a filter, does not disclose the claimed method of recovering the phosphorus compound by backwash. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the disclosure of the Greenberg patent, because backwash is a conventional means to remove material that is deposited onto a filter.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arun 5. Phasge whose telephone number is (703) 308-2528. The examiner can normally be reached on MONDAY-THURSDAY, 7:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nam X Nguyen can be reached on (703) 308-3322. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

Application/Control Number: 10/052,445

Art Unit: 1753

Page 5

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1753

asp

June 30, 2003